

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Claims 12 and 13 were withdrawn in response to restriction by the Office. In this response, the Applicant has amended claim 3 and argues that the rejection of the claims 1, 2, and 4-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is improper.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

The Applicant has amended claim 3 to eliminate any issues of enablement or definiteness.

Claim 3 has been amended to specify that, on each side of the hole, the powder is compacted in different directions that are along the same axis. This amendment is supported by paragraph [0026] in the application as filed. The particular direction in which the powder compaction occurs is inherently dependent on the relative movement of the tooling members relative to one another.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The Office rejected claims 1, 2, and 4-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Oaku (JP 60-63301).

The Applicant asserts that the Office has failed to show that each and every element of the claim is shown by Oaku.

Specifically, the method claim 1 requires the creation of an opening through a wall of a powder metal compact. The formation of the opening in the compact occurs by placing an

interface surface of a punch in sliding contact with another interface surface of the die set at a face-to-face interface so as to create an absence of powder metal powder at the interface. At this interface, an opening is created through a wall of the compact in a direction perpendicular to the axial direction at the face-to-face interface.

For an example of the geometry of components made by this method refer to FIGS. 2a-2d and FIG. 4. Observe that this method allows for the formation of a hole that extends through the component in a direction perpendicular to the direction of compaction. The formation of such a hole in this direction is hereto unknown in uni-axial powder metal compaction.

The Oaku reference does not show the creation of a powder metal compact having such a hole, nor a die set capable of performing the claimed method.

Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Office remove the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4-11 under Oaku.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner is of a different opinion, a telephone interview is requested so please call the undersigned attorney to schedule one.

It is not believed that any fees are due. However, in the event that other fees are due, including fees for an

extension of time or for excess claims, please charge them to
Deposit Account 17-0055.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 14, 2009

By: 

Daniel J. Ark
Registration No. 60,978
Quarles and Brady LLP
411 East Wisconsin Ave.
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 277-3061

QB\7998662.1